

551. a. 9. 3833
LETTER
TO A
FRIEND.

In Answer to
Mr. GIBBS'S
LETTER
TO A
GENTLEMAN
IN
LONDON.

By FRANCIS GUYBON, M. D.

*Infelicitèr Ægrotamus, cum plus Periculi est à Medico,
quam Morbo.*

NORWICH:
Printed by W. CHASE, in the Cockey-Lane, 1724.



GENERAL
LORD

By the
Printed by W. Chiswick, in the Strand, 1724.



will therefore please to pardon me for
taking leave to re-engage my Am-
bition, and to send this Second Let-
ter, which I am glad to find the same People

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE

C H A R L E S

Lord CORNWALLIS, &c.

My Lord,



H E Indispensable Obligation I am under of Vindicating the Truths contain'd in my First Letter, gives your Lordship the Trouble of a Second Address. And as your Lordship, I presume, will

The Dedication
will easily perceive that *Truth* tho'
it has been *Attacked*, has not been
Defeated, so I hope your Lordship
will therefore please to Pardon me for
taking Leave to Re-Indulge my Am-
bition, and to send this Second Let-
ter Abroad under the same Noble
Patronage.

I am,

My LORD,

Your Lordship's very obliged,

and most humbly devoted Servant,

FRAN. GUYBON.

A
LETTER

TO A FRIEND, &c.

Dear SIR,



Should never have given either You, or my Self the Trouble of a Letter, in Answer to so Trifling a Performance as Mr. GIBBS's Letter to a Gentleman in *London*; had it not been upon Account of the APPENDIX. Not all the Heat and Passion in which he wrote it; Not all the Uncivil and Provoking Language, which he has given me; (For when Heat and Passion are so Predominant, they seldom take Counsel either of Wisdom or Decency.)

cency) would ever have mov'd me to an Answer : had not the just Regard, which I bear to the Celebrated Names of those Physicians and Surgeons, who Under-sign'd the Stated Case, made it absolutely Necessary. And therefore, since I find my self Oblig'd to write, I shall e'en Consider the Letter, as well as the APPENDIX; and do not doubt, but to Return you a Full, tho' Candid, Answer to them Both.

G I V E me leave, Sir, in the first Place, to Observe in General, that Mr. Gibbs's Letter, to a Gentleman in *London*, tho' Occasion'd Chiefly, as the Title Declares, by Dr. GUYBON'S *Letter to a Friend*; instead of Answering any Part of that Letter, or Pointing out any of the Errors, or Mistakes in my way of Reasoning concerning the Nature and Cure, of those Diseases of the Bones I treated of; is Stuff'd with nothing but a Vast many Heavy Complaints; A great deal of Spiteful Railing; Several Manifest Falsities; and Two or Three *non a Propos* Instances: But Embellish'd with a most **Christian-Priest-like** Conclusion!

L E T me Observe also in General, that Mr. Gibbs has wholly Mistaken and Misrepresented my very End and Design, in Publishing that Letter. For there is Nothing more notoriously False, than what he without any Manner of Proof, has the Assurance to Assert; viz, That the Design of that Invidious Publication, as he most Mistakenly calls it, p. 2. was Levell'd either at his Misfortunes,

fortunes, or at the Reputation of other Men. He, indeed, seems to Triumph in having Prov'd what was never Deny'd, and in having Discover'd, what was never made a Secret. "Tis plain, says he, my poor Sons Unhappy Case gave Birth to that Performance; For tho' tis not directly quoted, yet tis pointed at from every Paragraph: The Suggestions and Inferences are Obvious. 'Tis true, and I was always free to acknowledge it, his Sons Case, and I will add that Epithet too, which he himself gives it; his *Son's unhappy Case* gave Birth to that *Performance*, as he is pleas'd to Stile it. For after I had turn'd my Thoughts for some time, upon those Particular Diseases of the Bones; I Flattered my self they might be of some Use to the Publick, not only in Explaining the Nature, and Pointing out the Regular Method of Curing those Diseases: but also in Preventing the having sometimes too Hasty a Recourse to Amputation in those Cases. And this I did without ever Mentioning or taking any manner of Notice of the Case of Mr. Gibbs's Son. I could therefore most Heartily have wish'd that Mr. Gibbs (or some Body else for Him; for I could never Imagine what Occasion there was for Him to concern Himself in the Controversy) would have Answer'd that Letter, in quite another Manner; without Troubling the World with any of his Idle Frivolous Complaints, or Obliging me to take Notice of Trifles, which will, in my opinion, Contribute but little, either to your Instruction or Diversion.

BUT I am forc'd to Proceed; and therefore Give me leave in the second place, Sir, to Observe more Particularly, that

that 'twas very Just, in the Gentleman at *London*, to Express so kind a Concern for the Loss of Mr. *Gibbs's* Son, because the Loss of him was Aggravated by Looſing him in ſuch a Manner. But what Reason that Gentleman had to Express the ſame kind Concern for the Uſage, p. 1. (I preſume he means Ill) which Mr. *Gibbs* met withal from a Neighbouring Phyſician; is ſo far from appearing, that upon a fair and impartial Enquiry into the matter, 'twill be found, that the Neighbouring Phyſician, has a great deal more Reason to Complain of Ill, and Unhandſome, Uſage from Mr. *Gibbs*. For I may be bold to Affirm, that there never was a greater, or more notorious Breach of a Long-ſtanding, and at that very time Subſiſting, Friendſhip, than in not Conſulting me in the Caſe of his Son. A Man would have been very much wanting to the Care of his Reputation, had he not reſented ſo notorious a Slur upon it. This very ſingle Conſideration therefore ſufficiently Vindicates me for writing to Mr. *Gibbs* at firſt; without any Regard either to the Truth, or Falſhood of Mr. *BRYARS's* Information. I was of Opinion, I muſt confeſs, that the only Reason of my not being Concern'd in the Caſe, was the Miſunderſtanding between Mr. *LAYMAN* and my Self. I thought that Mr. *LAYMAN* would, and did Uſe all his Intereſt and Application, to have any other Phyſician Concern'd. But when I was Inform'd from the Mouth of a Gentleman, that Mr. *LAYMAN* Propoſed, and that Mr. *Gibbs* Refuſed me, [the Truth of which Information Mr. *BRYARS* has ſeveral Times ſince Atteſted and Confirmed;] It cannot be ſuppoſed, but that it muſt raiſe in me a higher Reſentment.

ment. Moreover, there was a very Particular Circumstance, which Still Aggravated the Indignity; and that was Mr. *Gibbs's* coming several times to my House, (whilst his Son was under Mr. *Layman's* Care at *Tivetshall* and before Dr. *Pake* was call'd in) to BEG my Opinion, whether Mr. *Layman* proceeded Regularly in the Case. There never was a more Egregious and Ridiculous Evasion than what Mr. *Gibbs* offers by way of Excuse for himself. For he would go about to Perswade me, that I had no reason to take it Ill, that I was not called into his Sons Case, because it did not Require a Physician; and Dr. *Pake* was Consulted only as a Surgeon. Whereas in the first place, 'tis Undeniable beyond the Contradiction of any Man of Sense in these Matters, that there was as much Occasion for a Physician all the Time before his Sons Legg was taken off, as afterwards till his Death. Nay to ward off the Charge of Misconduct, in taking off the Limb, without the Advice or Prefence of a Physician, if Dr. *Pake* was call'd in only as a Surgeon; Mr. *Gibbs* then own'd in Plea, that Dr. *Pake* at the Operation was Consulted as a Physician. And as to what Mr. *Gibbs* would further Offer by way of Excuse in his Letter to a Gentleman p. 3. viz. That I was pleased to Obstruct my being Employed as a Physician, by giving too much Credit to my Friend, Mr. *Bryar's*, is extreamly Ridiculous and entirely False. My Credit to Mr. *Bryar's* Information, which I had not till after Mr. *Gibbs's* Son's Legg was taken off, might possibly hinder my being Employed afterwards; but cannot possibly be alledg'd in Excuse for my not having been Employ'd.

all the time before; which was what I wrote to Mr. *Gibbs* about and complain'd of as very great Breach of Friendship. And as to the Certificate at the End of Mr. *Gibbs's* Letter; there never was so Ridiculous and Nothing-to-the-Purpose an Advertisement ever Publish'd. For what avails Mr. *Layman's* Certifying that Mr. *Gibbs* Declar'd his Readiness to consult Dr. GUYBON before any other Person; or Mr. *Layman's* Declaring that Mr. *Gibbs*, Dr. *Pake*, and *Himself* did mutually agree, that Dr. *Guybon*, should visit Mr. *Gibbs's* Son as a Physician; when tis undeniable, that I was so far from being Consulted in the Case, or Visiting Mr. *Gibbs's* Son as Physician; that I never so much as once Saw him, during his whole Illness. And therefore I might very safely Report, and have also Given it under my Hand, if there had been occasion, that Mr. *Gibbs* did absolutely Refuse to Employ, that is, did never Employ me. It therefore undeniably follows, that as Mr. *Gibbs's* Son's Case did Require a Physician, and that as I never was Concern'd or Consulted in the Case; Mr. *Gibbs* has been Guilty of that Breach of Friendship, and consequently of that Ill and Unhandsome Usage towards me, which I laid to his Charge. And I have insisted the longer upon this Breach of Friendship, because Mr. *Gibbs* has had the Assurance to tell the World, in his Letter to a Gentleman p. 3. That the Charge was every way False and Groundless; and as Unhandsomely Supported.

BUT, because Mr. *Gibbs* does Heavily Complain, in his Letter to a Gentleman of (Ill) Usage p. 1. Of
Barbarous

Barbarous Treatment p. 2. and of my Treating him in a Manner which did not become me p. 2. I shall now proceed to Examine into the Foundation of his Numerous Complaints, and shew you how Groundless and Ridiculous they have all along been. When I first wrote to Mr *Gibbs* privately to Expostulate with him concerning the Breach of Friendship, which he had made; 'Tis true, I took Occasion to mention some Instances of Misconduct in the Case of his Son; to blame the Precipitate manner of taking off the Limb; nay to tell him that the Necessity of having the Limb taken off at all, was not sufficiently Apparent to me. But far was I from believing, that the Letter which I sent Mr. *Gibbs* upon this occasion, and upon which its evident all his heavy Complaints are founded, could possibly be so Misconstrued, and Misunderstood; its very end and Design so Mistaken, and Perverted; as I afterwards found they were. I could never have thought the Mentioning those Instances of Misconduct could possibly have been Interpreted as an Insulting and Triumphant over Mr. *Gibbs's* Misfortune. Far was it from me to write with any such Design! Nay, I do assure you, Sir, that no One was more Sensibly Touch'd with the Misfortune of a Friend, than I was with this of Mr. *Gibbs*, or would more willingly have Contributed, any thing to the Relief of it. And as I solemnly Profess, that I had no such End or Design, in writing to him; so I must take the Freedom with you also to Declare, that I could never believe my self Guilty of a Fault, in Informing a Father of Notorious and Flagrant Miscarriages, in a Case of his Son; or

even

even Suggesting to him, that his Sons Limb might have been Sav'd by better Management. Nay, I was so far deceiv'd my self, I Profesi, that I was fully Perswaded so free a Declaration of my Thoughts, would have Merited Thanks from Mr. Gibbs, instead of Reproaches; and would have been kindly Taken, instead of being Interpreted as a Breach of Christian Charity; as adding fresh Fuel to his Flames; or as pouring Vinegar instead of Oil into his Wounds. Besides, there are two or three other Considerations, which I have to Offer in Vindication of my self, for Mentioning the Instances of Misconduct, in my Letter to Mr. Gibbs. In the first place, I did it, in a very Private Manner; without any Desire or Design, that ever my Letter should have been made Publick or Expos'd. And therefore what Necessity soever Mr. Gibbs has been under of writing upon such a Dolefull Subject, as he expresses him self p. 1. has been wholly owing to his own, own, Indiscretion and Mismanagement; and he may thank himself for the Repeated Ruffles and Disturbances which he Complains, were given him upon this Occasion, For here I do solemnly Declare, and which I desire you would please, Sir particularly to Observe, that had not Mr. Gibbs Expos'd my First Letter, in so Publick a manner at Mr. LAYMAN's, there had been an entire End of the Affair at once; and I had never troubled him, or any body else, with a Second. Another Consideration, which I shall make bold to Offer in my Vindication, is, that I am able to make good the Charge. I desire nothing more than that my Justification for Mentioning the Misconducts,

conducts, may entirely depend upon my Capacity of making them good. How egregiously Ridiculous then, is Mr. Gibbs's Complaint, p. 3. of a Letter which I sent to a Clergyman, — At a Place where he was expected; The Subject of which concern'd no one in Company But Himself, — And in which, he says, was contained this handsome Expression, "The Patient had been [might have been, in my Copy] alive, had it not been for the most Egregious Mismanagement in the World. Whereas I wrote this very Letter to Mr. Randall, with a desire that he might Communicate it to him, as ill Using me for shewing Dr. Pake's Letters up and down the Country, (in which my Name was mentioned, and my Reputation reflected on) and not Communicating them to me. And as I acknowledge it concluded with such a Declaration of my Opinion; so that very Declaration, I affirm, was and is still reconcileable to the Strictest Decency, as well as the tenderest Regard to Truth. I cannot leave Mr. Gibbs's Complaints, without taking notice of two or three wild, ridiculous Proposals, which he mention'd in one of his Letters, and made Foundations of Complaint, viz; That if I observ'd from the Beginning any Mismanagement, in the Case of his Son, I should have acquainted him with it; and if I had any Reasons to condemn the too hasty Manner of taking off the Limb, I should have stepp'd into Mr. Layman's even without a Call, and have endeavour'd, as he expresses himself, a Reprieve for the condemn'd Limb. But alas! he should have consider'd that 'twas absolutely impossible for me to inform him of any Misconducts till they appear'd; and, that tho' I had

C

very

very Cogent Reasons to entertain a strong suspicion of *Mala Praxis*, from the beginning, yet I could not be said to have sufficient Proof of the same, till I receiv'd an Account of the Nature of the Affect, after the Limb was taken off. And what he propos'd, as to my going into Mr. *Layman's*, was altogether impracticable: For, twould have been entirely Ridiculous in me, who was not Concern'd at all in the Case, to have gone about Respiting the Amputation; for this very reason; because a Man would have thought, that an Apparent Mortification had render'd the precipitate Manner of taking off the Limb necessary, and then I might have been sufficiently laugh'd at for my Pains. I have been the longer in considering Mr. *Gibbs's* Complaints, because his Letter is very full of them, and because I am sensible that Complaints, tho' they have nothing at all in them, are very apt to move.

I proceed now to consider the weak Efforts which Mr. *Gibbs* has made towards a Vindication, or what he himself has said in Extenuation of the Charge, of *Mala Praxis*, in the Case before us; but, as what he has said in this Respect is very little, so it is as little to the Purpose. For in the first Place, tho' he is so much mistaken as to declare that both the Instances which he has produc'd, come much nearer to his Son's Case, than the darling One, as he calls it, in *Sculterus*, p. 7. and that the last, as far as he was capable of Judging, was Parallel to it, p. 7. yet I doubt not but to make it undeniably evident, that the two Instances were neither Parallel to one another,

ther, nor to the Case of his Son. That they were not Parallel, but widely different Cases, is sufficiently apparent from his own Words. For when the Surgeon in the One made a Puncture upon the Tumour with his Imposthume Lancet, nothing but a small Quantity of Blood issued out, p. 6. and yet all the Surgeons concerned in the Other agreed, it was not proper to lay open the Swelling, for fear the Patient should have bled to Death, p. 7. But I shall more particularly consider the Case of Mr. *Smith*, because Mr. *Gibbs* seems to lay the greatest Stress upon it, p. 7. Now even this Case of Mr. *Smith*, is very far from being Parallel to Mr. *Gibbs*'s Son's; because, in the first Place, it does not at all appear, even from Mr. *Gibbs*'s own Relation of it, that this Case can be said to come under the Denomination either of a Caries or an Exostosis. And if it does by no Means appear, that Mr. *Smith*'s Case comes under either of these Denominations, to what End and Purpose was it produc'd in Vindication of *Mala Praxis*, in either of those Affects? How apparent then, beyond Contradiction is it, that Mr. *Gibbs*, by producing this very Instance, has been so far from apprehending my Way of Reasoning, that he has entirely mistaken my Meaning, in the Letter to a Friend: For what I advanc'd in that Letter was, That a Carious Exostosis cannot be said to be regularly treated, unless the Part be first laid open, and Endeavours us'd to procure an Exfoliation, before Recourse be had to Amputation. But I never asserted in that Letter, that in all Tumours requiring Amputation, 'twas necessary to lay open the Part; and therefore this Instance

2 A. serves.

serves only to prove what is entirely out of the Question, and what I never deny'd, *viz.* That Amputation may sometimes, or in some Tumours, be regularly and successfully perform'd, without opening the Part. And in the Case of Mr. *Smith*, 'twas undoubtedly more advisable to have Recourse to Amputation, (and that Operation, Mr. *Gibbs* says, p. 7. was judg'd necessary by three very eminent Surgeons) than to run the Hazard of bleeding to Death, by laying open the Tumour : But what then ? What Relation has all this to the Case of Mr. *Gibbs's* Son ? For, in the first Place, I defy any of the Gentlemen concerned in that Case to alledge, that the Opening of the Part was deferr'd from the Fear of a Hemorrhage ; and because, in the Second, that but little or no Blood, when the Part was *at last* laid open, came from it. And as to the other Case of the Child at *Northwalsbam*, if it was neither a Caries nor an Exostosis (and it does not appear from Mr. *Gibbs's* stating it, that it was either) 'twas as much out of the Question, and produc'd to as little Purpose as that of Mr. *Smith* ; and it might possibly be necessary to have Recourse to Amputation, without laying open the Tumour . But if it was either a Caries or an Exostosis, I have still the same Reasons to affirm (till somebody offers me more convincing Ones to the contrary) that the neglecting to open the Part, and to endeavour to promote an Exfoliation, before Recourse was had to Amputation, was, notwithstanding the Child might survive the Operation, irregular Practice, and equally condemnable with that in the Case of Mr. *Gibbs's* Son.

AS to my Observation from Dr. Bennet, Mr. Gibbs is pleas'd in the first Place to remark, p. 9. that there is not one Word of *Dying Tabid* in the whole Paragraph. Now this very notable Remark was occasioned by a Fault of the Press, and the Words *Generally Die*, in p. 12. of my first Letter to a Friend, should have been printed in the same Character with *Tabid*, as being an Addition of my own, and not the Words of the Author quoted: But which I think I had a great deal of Reason to add, because if those who have had Members Amputated, are subject to the worst of Defluxions upon their Lungs; those who are subject to the worst of those Defluxions, may consequently be said *Generally to Die Tabid*. And as wonderful is the Discovery which he makes, that the Translator should seem to be Cited, and not the Author, when the Reader was told before, that the Observation was met with in the English Edition, or Translation of Dr. Bennet's *Theatrum Tabidorum*. It may please you to observe, that he has left out the Word *Generally*, in p. 8. on purpose, I presume, to usher in a Nothing to the Purpose Information; which he says he has had (and which I believe may hold true in some) viz. That several Persons who have lost their Limbs are Fat. And as to the Positive Declaration of his own Opinion and Resolution, viz. That should his other Son labour under the like Misfortune, he would still pursue the very same Methods, is such a Declaration, in my Opinion, as a Wise Man would not ventured to have made, even upon a Supposition that the first Methods had not been so *Notoriously Wrong*.

D

DUT

BUT some Men are so tenacious of their Opinions, that rather than part with any of them, they will willfully shut both their Eyes and Ears to all the Means of Conviction.

THERE are some other Things in Mr. Gibbs's Letter, which I pass by without, because I despise them, and think them not worth particular Notice. As the Physicians being Animated, if not Assisted, by the Surgeon at *Harleston*; My sending the Instance of *Scultetus* up and down the Country in Triumph; and His own declaring, that he shall never trouble himself any more to Consult the ORACLE at *Diss*, &c. But I cannot conclude, without a particular Remark on the Final Embellishment of this Doughty Performance; the Prophecy. Now as to this same Prophecy, Sir, I must take the Freedom with you to Declare, That it Affects me but little, which Way soever it be Interpreted, or to which World soever the Eternal Disgrace and Confusion may be supposed to Relate; for this very Reason: Because, *as well as I thought I knew Mr. Gibbs, I never knew that he had any Pretensions to the Title of a Profound Divine*; so for that very Reason, I believe he will in the End, prove no other than a *False Prophet*.

I come now to answer the Appendix to Mr. Gibbs's Letter; which, chiefly Sir, occasion'd you the Trouble of this. And give me Leave in the first Place to Observe, that Dr. *Pake*, in the Case as stated by him to the *London Physicians and Surgeons*, has Reduc'd Mr. Gibbs's
Son's

Son's Affect under the Combin'd Denomination of a Carious Exostosis. And this was the more agreeably Surprising to me, not only because an Exostosis and a Caries, were the two particular Diseases of the Bones, concerning the Nature and Cure of which, I wrote my Letter to a Friend; But because Mr. Gibbs has also had the Assurance to tell the World that I only Form'd a random Judgment of his Son's Case, p. 8. and even Doctor Pake himself has as groundlessly Reported up and down the Country, that I Condemn'd without knowing the Case. But tho' Doctor Pake and I are thus far agreed as to the Nature and Denomination of the Affect, yet I must now beg Leave, Sir, in the second Place, freely to tell you my Opinion, viz. That in the Treatment of this Carious Exostosis, there never was more Egregious Mismanagement in the World. This very Charge I had by several Letters made upon Dr. Pake, before I published my first Letter to a Friend; Dr. Pake having before-hand sent several Letters to Mr. Gibbs, in which, as I observ'd to you before, my Name was mentioned, and my Reputation reflected upon: But he, instead of attempting any Vindication of himself from a Charge of *Mala Praxis*, returned me shuffling and evasive Answers; had so little Manners as to call me a meer Caviller, a confident Asserter, and an authoritative Calumniator; and to tell me that he was engaged in more momentous Affairs than trifling with me; and even at last rather chose to Screen himself under Authorities, than Answer the Charge. The Case, said he, has been represented to, and approved of, by Dr. Mead, Dr. Plumtree, Phyli-

Physician of *St. Thomas's Hospital, &c.* and I value neither your Censure, nor Approbation. Now my Charge of *Alala Praxis* in the Management of this Carious Exostosis, is founded upon these two Articles. 1. In neglecting so long to open the Part. 2. In taking off the Limb so soon after the Part was opened. As to the first Article of the Charge, it appears from the Case, as stated by Dr. *Pake*, That in *October 1720*, the young Gentleman was committed to the Care of Mr. *Layman* of *Diss*, who treated him for above a Month with several external Applications and purging Pills with Calomel; but without Success; That on the 25th of *November*, Dr. *Pake* was call'd in, who advis'd a gentle Salivation, under which he continued about a Fortnight, but without Relief; and That it was not till the 25th Day of *December* the Part was laid open. If what I have advanc'd in my Letter to a Friend, concerning the Nature, and regular Method of curing a Caries and an Exostosis be true; and nothing either in Mr. *Gibbs's* Letter, or in the Appendix, does in the least Invalidate the Truth of it; 'tis evident beyond Contradiction, that here was a most manifest, notorious Neglect, in laying open this Carious Exostosis: And this Neglect was still aggravated by what Dr. *Pake* himself acknowledges; That on the 11th of *December* he concluded the Bone foul: For when he concluded the Bone foul, instead of declaring that nothing but Amputation could relieve the Case, he should have had the Part immediately opened, and Endeavours used to procure an Exfoliation; which probably might have prevented Amputation. There never was, nor can be a more
a propos

a proper Instance, than the Case in *Scolietus* to shew, how far Nature is not only willing, but able by Exfoliation, to sling off Carious Bones: For in that Case, not only the Head of the Fibula, but the whole Tibia Exfoliated, the Man recovered without the Loss of his Limb, and eleven Years afterwards was able to walk without a Stick. And as this Neglect in endeavouring an Exfoliation, was the Main Article in the Charge of *Mala Praxis* in Mr. Gibbs's Son's Case; so I desire, Sir, you would be pleased to take particular Notice, that the Testimony of the Physicians and Surgeons of London, who undersigned the stated Case, does not at all Concern, or bears no Manner of Relation to this Part of the Charge; And therefore if this first Part of it can be Maintain'd, the Charge of *Mala Praxis* is made Good, notwithstanding what the London Physicians and Surgeons have Testified in the Case. For to Suppose that there was an absolute Necessity of taking off the Limb at the Time the Operation was perform'd, does not at all Justify the long Neglect in Opening the Part. Nay, it may be reasonably Suggested, that the long Neglect in Opening the Part, and in Endeavouring to procure an Exfoliation, might render the Amputation at that Time more Necessary, or the Amputation might become more Necessary by that Neglect.

BUT I proceed now to the second Article of the Charge, viz. The Taking off the Limb so soon after the

the Part was Opened. And as 'tis evident from the same stated Case, That the Part was Opened on the 25th of *December*, and the Limb taken off the 28th: So this Precipitate Manner of Proceeding, seems to be Justify'd by the Testimony of these Gentlemen, in their Answer to the second Question. But Sorry am I, to have the Misfortune of differing in Opinion from Gentlemen so Celebrated in their Professions. The Reasons which induc'd me to Condemn the hasty Manner of taking off the Limb, and to pronounce the Operation Precipitate were, 1. Because there were no Apparent Signs of a Mortification. 2. Because neither Dr. *Pake*, nor any of the Gentlemen concerned in the Case, have been able to shew me, what Detriment would have accrued to the Patient, had the Limb continued on longer. And give me Leave on the other Hand, Sir, to Observe, that the Testimony of the Gentlemen in *London*, consists only of Categorical Answers returned to so many Questions, without any Reasons annex'd; which Answers Dr. *Plumptre*, as he himself informs me, Drew up, and the rest of the Gentlemen Sign'd. And whenever they shall please to Declare the Reasons of their Opinion (which, I do assure you, I earnestly Sollicit) they may possibly Convince me of the Error of mine. But be that how it will, the Charge of *Mala Praxis* in the Case before us is undeniably made Good; for notwithstanding what either Mr. *Gibbs* or Dr. *Pake* have said, or the Physicians and Surgeons of *London* have Testified,

Testified, the following Position stands Firm and Unshaken, *viz.* That a Carious Exostosis upon the Head of the Fibula, cannot be said to be Regularly Treated, unless the Part be first laid Open, and Endeavours used to Procure an Exfoliation, before Recourse be had to Amputation.

I am, SIR,

Your very affectionate Friend,

Diss, Oct. 26,
1723.

and humble Servant,

F. G.



527 a. d.

1797 (1798)

Testified, the following Testimonies stands Firm and Un-
shaken, viz. That a Certain Exchequer upon the Head of
the Public cannot be said to be Regularly Treasured, un-
less the Part be first laid Open, and Indegavours made
to procure an Exchequer before Records be had to
Amputation.

I am, Sir,

Your very Obedient Servant,

and humble Secretary,

1793.

T. G.

